

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 31-45 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 34, 39, and 44 have been canceled through this Reply. Therefore, claims 31-33, 35-38, 40-43, and 45 are currently pending of which claims 31, 36, and 41 are independent. Claims 31, 36, and 41 have amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a personal interview with the Applicants' representative on December 19, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that an amendment to independent claims 31, 36, and 41 to include, *inter alia*, "*wherein said constraints are constraints executed within the transaction which allow conceptual rules to be broken during the transaction, but allow the database system to be in a consistent state at the beginning and end of the transaction*" would overcome the outstanding prior art rejection.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner that further amendment may be necessary to distinguish the claimed invention from the applied prior art references, independent claims 31, 36, and 41 have been amended as agreed upon during the interview merely to expedite prosecution. It is respectfully submitted that upon review one would conclude the amendments made to the claims do not add any new matter to the application and do not raise any new issue.

35 U.S.C. §102- Jacobs

Claims 31-34, 36-39, and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Jacobs et al. (US 6,105,025). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 34, 39, and 44 have been cancelled through this Reply rendering the rejection of these claims as moot.

Independent claims 31, 36, and 41 have been amended to include, *inter alia*, "*wherein said constraints are constraints executed within the transaction which allow conceptual rules to be broken during the transaction, but allow the database system to be in a consistent state at the beginning and end of the transaction.*" As acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview on December 19, 2007, Jacobs fails to teach or suggest the above identified claim feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw the anticipation rejection of independent claims 31, 36, and 41 based on Jacobs.

Claims 32-33, 37-38, and 42-43, are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Jacobs, Jenkins

Claims 35, 40, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jacobs et al. (US 6,105,025) in view of Jenkins (US 5,899,993). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 35, 40, and 45 depend from claims 31, 36, and 41, respectively. As demonstrated above, Jacobs fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "*wherein said constraints are constraints executed within the transaction which allow conceptual rules to be broken during the transaction, but allow the database system to be in a consistent state at the beginning and end of the transaction*" as recited in claims 31, 36, and 41. Jenkins has not been, and indeed cannot be, relied upon to fulfill at least this deficiency of Jacobs. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 35, 40, and 45 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claims 31, 36, and 41, respectively.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that claims are allowable.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/720,262
Amendment dated December 20, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 20, 2007

Docket No.: 1380-0255PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant